

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12, which were all of the then pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent 6, 360, 236 (Kahn, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,860,073 (Ferrel, et al.).

Independent Claims 1, 5 and 9 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. New Claims 13 and 14, which are dependent from Claim 1, are being amended to describe preferred features of the invention.

For the reasons advanced below, Applicants believe that Claims 1-14, a presented herewith, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, hence, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims and new Claims 13 and 14.

The present invention, generally, relates to a method and system to automatically change the content of a Web page based on the title of that web page. In accordance with the invention, a computer program is provided that automatically reads the page title, identifies a section name based on that section title, and then alters the style of the page based on that section name. For example, with the preferred embodiment of the invention, the web page is part of a section of a Website, and the identified name is the name of the web site section to which the page belongs. That section name will be automatically highlighted when a use views the web page.

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest the above-described automated features of the present invention.

For example, Khan, et al. discloses a computer product for designing a document over a data network. The computer product is specifically provided to enable and to facilitate the design of this document by means of a collaborative effort. In this design project, a web page is displayed that lists a number of projects. Information about those projects may be accessed via the web page, and that information may then be used to design a document, such as an engineering or architecture drawing, shown on another web page.

While Khan, et al. discloses a computer product having numerous design features, that product does not provide the automated page design of the present invention.

Ferrel, et al. was cited for its disclosure of style sheets. Style sheets are known. A unique and not obvious feature of the present invention is not that a style sheet is used, but is how that style sheet is used to help achieve the automated page design of this invention.

This feature of the invention is of utility for a number of reasons. For example, as discussed in more detail in the present application, with this feature, no manual intervention is needed as new pages are added to a web site. As new pages are added, all a developer needs to do is simply follow an established naming convention, and the appropriate section will be automatically highlighted on the web page.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also fail to disclose or suggest this feature of the invention.

Independent claims 1, 5 and 9 clearly describe this feature of the invention. In particular, Claim 1 positively sets forth a computer program that, in response to the step of selecting the web page, automatically reads the page title, identifies a section name based on that title, and alters the predefined style attributes based on the section name. Claim 5, which is directed to a system for dynamically altering the contents of a web page, sets forth a computer program having means for automatically reading the web page title, identifying the section name based on that title, and altering the style attributes based on the section name. Claim 9, which is directed to program storage device includes the step of in response to the selecting to the web page, automatically performing the steps of reading the web page title, identifying a section name based on that title, and altering the pre-defined style attributes based on that section name.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 5 and 9 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, Claims 1, 5 and 9 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-4, 13 and 14 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Also, Claims 6-8 are dependent from Claim 5 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 10-12 are dependent from Claim 9 and are allowable therewith.

The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims and new Claims 13 and 14.

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

*John S. Sensny*  
John S. Sensny  
28,757

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530

JSS/rjl